

In the Office Action, Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 for indefiniteness and were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,245,534 (Waterhouse) or U.S. Patent No. 5,572,653 (DeTemple) and under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,012,040 (Goodwin) and U.S. Patent No. 6,107,936 (Zimmerman) and under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of alleged admitted prior art. These rejections have all been rendered moot in view of the cancellation of Claims 1-21. However, the art rejections will be addressed with respect to newly added Claims 59-64.

Newly added Claim 59 defines an information processing system for managing a price of a service which includes a first storage means for storing a plurality of prices corresponding to a service and second storage means for storing one of the plurality of prices stored in the first storage means corresponding to a shop.

The remaining independent claims address an information processing apparatus, an information method and a computer-readable memory for storing a program along the lines of Claim 59. In this regard, each of the claims includes the unique feature of "storing a plurality of prices corresponding to a service and storing one of the plurality of stored prices corresponding to a shop".

The applied art of record is not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features. Specifically, Waterhouse discloses a method for confirming whether price tags are correctly located on displayed items by a host. As such, Waterhouse does not disclose the features of the newly added independent claims.

DeTemple discloses detecting prices of items displayed in a shop by an IR receiver and showing them on a display. This is quite different than storing a plurality of

prices corresponding to a service and storing one of the stored prices corresponding to a shop.

Goodwin simply discloses a process for changing prices of items to be displayed on an electric price label and Zimmerman simply discloses installing a noise maker to an electric price label so as not only to display a price, but also to make a noise during special promotions. Neither of these references discloses managing prices of a service corresponding to a shop as disclosed in the present invention by storing a plurality of prices corresponding to a service and storing one of the plurality of prices corresponding to a shop.

In view of the deficiencies of the references, the combination of references fails to disclose or to suggest storing a plurality of prices corresponding to a service and a first storage means in advance and one of the plurality of prices stored in the first storage means corresponding to each shop. Accordingly, the independent claims are believed to be allowable over Waterhouse, DeTemple, Goodwin or Zimmerman, whether taken alone or in combination.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 36,171

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 35559 v 1